UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,591	09/27/2004	Michael Burr	2006579-0272 (CTX-093DV)	5590

69665   7590   05/14/2008
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC.
TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER
NICKERSON, JEFFREY L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Office Action Summary</td><td>Application No.
10/711,591</td><td>Applicant(s)
BURR ET AL.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner
JEFFREY NICKERSON</td><td>Art Unit
2142</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 March 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *27 September 2004* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is in response to Application No. 10/711,591 filed on 27

September 2004. The amendment presented on 07 March 2008, which provides

change to the abstract and claims 1, 8-9, 16, 23, and 24, is hereby acknowledged.

Claims 1-30 have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments, filed 07 March 2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of

claim(s) 1-30 under 35 USC 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive.

Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a

new ground(s) of rejection is being made.

Drawings

3.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5)

because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the

description: 121(Figure 1A), 122(Figure 1A), 144(Figure 1B), 221(Figure 3B),

750(Figure 7).

4.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5)

because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the

description: 308 ([0071]), 304b ([0073]), 180n ([0082]), 532 ([0091]), 1-4 ([0102]), 700

([0103]), 335 ([0104]).

5.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters 221 (Figure 3B) and 332 (Figure 332) have both been used to designate "Network Identifier Generator". The examiner recommends changing all instances to be that of 332, in order to be consistent with the specification. The examiner further recommends reading the snippets below in the Specification section to view an objection detailing how to fix a subset of the drawing problems.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121 (d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121 (b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121 (d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. **The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.**

Specification

6.   The amendment presented on 07 March 2008 providing change to the specification is noted. All prior objections regarding the specification are hereby withdrawn. However, new objections to the specification are being made.

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure. The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details. The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

7.   The abstract of the disclosure is objected to under 37 CFR 1.72(b) because it contains implied phraseology. The first sentence of the abstract contains the phrase "The invention relates to", which falls into the category of implied phraseology, and should be deleted. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

8.   The disclosure is objected to under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because of the following

informalities: inconsistent use of reference characters. The applicant uses reference

character 104 to designate a main memory unit ([0033]) when it should be 122. The

applicant uses reference character 118 to designate installation devices ([0039]) when it

should be 116. The applicant uses reference character 330 to represent a network ID

generator when it should be 332 ([0062]). The applicant uses reference character 308

to represent a generic client when it should be 108 ([0071]). The applicant uses

reference character 320 to represent a socket library when it should be 322 ([0072]).

The applicant uses reference character 304b to represent another program when it

should be 340b ([0073]). The applicant uses reference character 180n to represent

clientele instead of 108n ([0082]). The applicant uses reference character 1-4 to

represent a network when it should be 104 ([0102]). The applicant uses reference

character 304 to represent programs when it should be 340 ([0103] and [0109]). The

applicant uses reference characters 335 and 336 to represent a DHCP server when it

should be 334 ([0104]). The applicant uses reference character 740 to represent a

virtual hostname generator ([0110], [0113], and [0118]) when it should be 750.

Appropriate correction is required in all instances.

Claim Objections

9.   Applicant is advised that should claims 10 and 12 be found allowable, claims 11

and 13 will be objected to, respectively, under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial

duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close

in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it

is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate

of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Regarding this objection, attempting to distinguish between repetitive processing as

applying to "first" and "second" users when the process itself is identical is not effective

and not given patentable weight, as any processing that occurs for a plurality of users

covers any incrementally claimed repetitive process. Theoretically, if given patentable

weight, one could merely restate the entire process for one cycle longer than the prior

art and it would be patentable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

10.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

11.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12.   Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to

comply with the enablement requirement.

Regarding claims 1 and 16, while the disclose is enabling for "**…providing a network address, for a user accessing a computer on a network, independent from the computer the user is accessing…**", it does not reasonably provide enablement for "**…providing a network addressing scheme, for a user accessing a computer on a network, independent from the user is accessing…**". The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Applicant's invention is directed towards a method for assigning network addresses independent of the user's computer. Applicant's invention is not directed towards a method for assigning/selecting an addressing scheme, applicant's invention is the scheme itself.

Regarding claims 2-15 and 17-30, these claims inherit the lack of enablement of their parent independent claim.

13.   Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1 and 16, the preambles contain the phrase "a uniform network addressing scheme for a user accessing a computer on a network independent from the computer the user is accessing". The object of the sentence, that the clause "independent from the computer the user is accessing" is directed to, is unclear. Is the

user independent from the computer the user is accessing? Is the computer

independent from the computer the user is accessing? Is the scheme independent from

the computer the user is accessing? Is the network independent from the computer the

user is accessing? For purposes of further examination the examiner will entertain the

idea that the address, which the network addressing scheme assigns, is independent

from the computer the user is accessing.

Further regarding claims 1 and 16, the last two limitations of these claims are very

confusing and difficult to understand. The examiner believes applicant is attempting to

state that the hostnames are being mapped to an IP address for further network

communication, as it well known in the art, but the applicant is doing it in a very

roundabout way. For purpose of further examination the examiner will consider the

limitations to read "associating the (first | second) virtual hostname of the (first | second)

user with a (first | second) IP address and using both said (first | second) virtual

hostname and said (first | second) IP address for network communications via the first

computer," wherein first or second is used depending on the respective limitation.

Regarding claims 2-15 and 17-30, these claims inherit the indefiniteness of their parent

independent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15.   Claims 1-2, 4-9, 16-18, and 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Hipp et al (US 7,210,147 B1), and further in view of Abdo (US

2003/0188195 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Hipp teaches a method for providing a network address, for a user

accessing a computer on a network, independent from the computer the user is

accessing (Hipp: abstract specifies providing virtual IP and hostname to application that

is node-independent), comprising the steps of:

        obtaining a plurality of virtual host names, each of the plurality of virtual host

names comprising a host name uniquely identifying an application from a plurality of

applications (Hipp: col 13, line 54 – col 14, line 17 specifies the host names are unique

and can be dynamically generated and assigned, providing that a plurality of them can

be obtained);

        assigning, from a plurality of virtual host names, a first virtual host name to a first

application accessing the network via a first computer (Hipp: col 13, line 54 – col 14, line

17 specifies the host names can be dynamically assigned to an application, are unique,

and are associated with first node via a virtual interface; See also Figure 1 for network),

the first computer having a computer host name and a computer internet protocol

address to connect to the network (Hipp: col 14, line 1 – 37 provide that the physical

computer the application is running on has a physical interface connected to a network,

and can have a IP address and hostname);

assigning, from the plurality of virtual host names, a second virtual host name,

different from the first virtual host name, to a second application accessing the network

via the first computer (Hipp: col 13, line 54 - col 14, line 17 specifies the physical nodes

maintain a virtual network interface that allows for mapping a plurality of virtual IP

addresses with the existing physical network interface, thereby providing for multiple

applications to use virtual IDs on the same node);

associating the first virtual hostname of the first user with a first IP address and

using both said first virtual hostname and said first IP address for network

communications via the first computer (Hipp: col 13, line 54 - col 14, line 17 provide a

virtual hostname is associated with an virtual IP address; col 13, lines 36-44 specifies

resolution process for network comm.);

associating the second virtual hostname of the second user with a second IP

address and using both said second virtual hostname and said second IP address for

network communications via the first computer (Hipp: col 13, line 54 - col 14, line 17

provide a virtual hostname is associated with an virtual IP address; col 13, lines 36-44

specifies resolution process for network comm.; col 13, line 54 – col 14, line 17 provide

this can be done for multiple applications operating on a single computer/node).

Hipp does not teach wherein the application is a user session.

Abdo, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein the application is a user

session and therefore associated with a user (Abdo: [0003]-[0004]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to utilize the teachings of Abdo for having applications be user

sessions and associated with a user. The teachings of Abdo, when implemented in the

Hipp system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to associate virtual hostnames and

IP addresses to users via user sessions. One of ordinary skill in the art would be

motivated to utilize the teachings of Abdo in the Hipp system in order to easily manage

communications over a network by partitioning user sessions with virtual identifiers.

Regarding claim 2, the Hipp/Abdo system teaches wherein step (a) further comprises

obtaining a plurality of IP addresses for assigning unique IP addresses to each of the

first user and the second user (Hipp: col 13, line 20 – col 14, line 17 provides that

unique virtual IPs are assigned dynamically from a pool to applications; Abdo: [0003]-

[0004] for applications being user sessions and associated with users).

Regarding claim 4, the Hipp/Abdo system teaches wherein step (a) further comprises

reserving at least one of the plurality of IP addresses for at least one of the first user

and second user (Hipp: col 13, line 20 – col 14, line 17 provide that the virtual IPs are

assigned uniquely to applications, thereby reserving them for sole use by the

application; Abdo: [0003]-[0004] provides for applications being user sessions and associated with users).

Regarding claim 5, the Hipp/Abdo system teaches wherein step (c) further comprises associating the at least one reserved IP address with at least one of the first virtual host name and the second virtual host name (Hipp: col 13, lines 36-44).

Regarding claim 6, the Hipp/Abdo system teaches wherein step (b) further comprises assigning, from the plurality of IP addresses, a first IP address to the first user, and a second IP address, different from the first IP address, to the second user (Hipp: col 13, line 20 – col 14, line 17 provide the virtual IPs are assigned uniquely to applications; Abdo: [0003]-[0004] provides for applications being user sessions and associated with users).

Regarding claim 7, the Hipp/Abdo system teaches wherein step (a) further comprises registering, with a name resolution service, at least one of the plurality of virtual host names to at least one of the first user and the second user (Hipp: col 13, lines 21-44 provides that applications are registered with the VNI framework and the virtual IPs resolve to the application via the VNI framework, or virtual hostnames resolve via the DNS to the virtual IP and then via the VNI framework to the application; Abdo: [0003]-[0004] provides for applications being user sessions and associated with users).

Regarding claim 8, the Hipp/Abdo system teaches wherein the name rsolution service

comprises one of a DNS or a WINS (Hipp: col 13, lines 35-44 specifies DNS).

Regarding claim 9, the Hipp/Abdo system teaches wherein the virtual host name

identifies one of a session of the user or a program used by the user (Hipp: col 13, line

20 – col 14, line 17 provides for identifying the application; Abdo: [0003]-[0004] provides

for applications being user sessions).

Regarding claim 16, this system claim comprises limitations corresponding to that of

claim 1 and the same rationale of rejection is applied, where applicable.

Regarding claim 17, this system claim comprises limitations corresponding to that of

claim 2 and the same rationale of rejection is applied, where applicable.

Regarding claim 18, this system claim comprises limitations corresponding to that of

claim 6 and the same rationale of rejection is applied, where applicable.

Regarding claim 20, this system claim comprises limitations corresponding to that of

claim 4 and the same rationale of rejection is applied, where applicable.

Regarding claim 21, this system claim comprises limitations corresponding to that of

claim 5 and the same rationale of rejection is applied, where applicable.

Regarding claim 22, this system claim comprises limitations corresponding to that of

claim 7 and the same rationale of rejection is applied, where applicable.

Regarding claim 23, this system claim comprises limitations corresponding to that of

claim 8 and the same rationale of rejection is applied, where applicable.

Regarding claim 24, this system claim comprises limitations corresponding to that of

claim 9 and the same rationale of rejection is applied, where applicable.

16.   Claims 3, 14-15, 19, and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Hipp et al (US 7,210,147 B1), in view of Abdo (US 2003/0188195

A1), and in further view of Bahlmann (US 6,195,689 B1).

Regarding claim 3, the Hipp/Abdo system does not teach obtaining the at least one of

the plurality of IP addresses from a DHCP server.

Bahlmann, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein IP addresses are

obtained from a DHCP server (Bahlmann: col 3, lines 25-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to utilize the teachings of Bahlmann for using a DHCP server to

dynamically allocate IP addresses. The teachings of Bahlmann, when implemented in

the Hipp/Abdo system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to dynamically assign IP

addresses to users. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Bahlmann in the Hipp/Abdo system in order to utilize a well-known and supported dynamic IP address leasing protocol.

Regarding claim 14, the Hipp/Abdo/Bahlmann system teaches wherein step (a) further comprises naming at least one of the plurality of virtual host names with a portion of the characters representing the user's identity on the network (Bahlmann: col 6, lines 9-26 specify generating hostname based on identity; Abdo: [0003]-[0005] and [0023] for wherein an identity is a user).

Regarding claim 15, the Hipp/Abdo/Bahlmann system teaches wherein step (a) further comprises naming at least one of the plurality of virtual hostnames with a suffix identifying the session of the user when the user is concurrently accessing multiple computers on a network (Bahlmann: col 6, lines 9-25 for generating hostname with suffix identifier; Abdo: [0003]-[0005] and [0023] for wherein an identifier is for concurrent user sessions).

Regarding claim 19, this system claim comprises limitations corresponding to that of claim 3 and the same rationale of rejection is applied, where applicable.

Regarding claim 29, this system claim comprises limitations corresponding to that of claim 14 and the same rationale of rejection is applied, where applicable.

Regarding claim 30, this system claim comprises limitations corresponding to that of

claim 15 and the same rationale of rejection is applied, where applicable.

17.   Claims 10-13 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Hipp et al (US 7,210,147 B1), in view of Abdo (US 2003/0188195

A1), and in further view of Civanlar et al (US 5,878,212).

Regarding claim 10, the Hipp/Abdo system teaches wherein step (b) further comprises

assigning the first virtual hostname to the first user accessing (hosted on) a second

computer (Hipp: abstract specifies the virtual hostname and virtual IP follow the

application when it migrates to another node; See also col 2, lines 1-25).

The Hipp/Abdo system does not teach associating the first virtual hostname with

an IP address of the second computer.

Civanlar, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches associating the first virtual

hostname with an IP address of the second computer (Civanlar: abstract provides for

dynamically adjusting which physical computer a virtual hostname maps to).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to utilize the teachings of Civanlar for adjusting the name resolution

mapping. The teachings of Civanlar, when implemented in the Hipp/Abdo system, will

allow one of ordinary skill in the art to dynamically adjust the virtual hostname mapping

for whichever computer the user session is being initiated on. One of ordinary skill in

the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Civanlar in the Hipp/Abdo system

in order to allow a virtual hostname to remain static and ease communication

addressing.

Regarding claim 11, this claim comprises limitations corresponding to claim 10, but

wherein the user is the second user. Hipp provides for a plurality of applications and

therefore the same rationale of rejection is applied, where applicable.

Regarding claims 12, the Hipp/Abdo/Civanlar system teaches wherein step (b) further

comprises assigning, while the first user accesses the first computer, a third virtual

hostname to the first user accessing a second computer (Hipp: col 13, line 20 – col 14,

line 17 provide that applications are uniquely assigned a virtual hostname and IP; Abdo:

[0003]-[0004] provides for applications being user sessions) and associating the third

virtual hostname with an internet protocol address of the second computer associated

with the first user (Civanlar: abstract teaches dynamically changing mappings of

hostnames to IP addresses).

The Hipp/Abdo/Civanlar system doesn't explicitly teach the act is occurring while

the user is still accessing a first computer and that the new virtual hostname is

associated with said user accessing a first computer.

This would be obvious for two reasons. First, when assigning virtual hostnames

and IP addresses to user sessions (as taught by Hipp and Abdo), and a user happened

to create a second user session (no matter which computer it was initiated on), any

external device/service would need to be able to differentiate between the two user sessions for communication purposes and therefore assigning the two sessions different virtual identities would be obvious. Secondly, Hipp uses a general virtual identity assignment algorithm, wherein each instantiation of an application gets its own virtual identity. This would provide that should the same user initiate n number of user sessions, that n number of virtual identities would be provided for said user sessions.

Regarding claim 13, this comprises limitations corresponding to claim 12, and wherein the user is the second user. Hipp provides for a plurality of applications and therefore the same rationale of rejection is applied, where applicable.

Regarding claim 25, this system claim comprises limitations corresponding to that of claim 10 and the same rationale of rejection is applied, where applicable.

Regarding claim 26, this system claim comprises limitations corresponding to that of claim 11 and the same rationale of rejection is applied, where applicable.

Regarding claim 27, this system claim comprises limitations corresponding to that of claim 12 and the same rationale of rejection is applied, where applicable.

Regarding claim 28, this system claim comprises limitations corresponding to that of claim 13 and the same rationale of rejection is applied, where applicable.

Cited Pertinent Prior Art

18.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

       a.   Bacher et al (US 2006/0045089 A1) discloses virtualizing hosts behind a

network adapter.

       b.   Carollo et al (US 2004/0267866 A1) discloses managing guest OS

networking with virtual IP addresses.

       c.   Hirschfeld et al (US 2003/0051021 A1) discloses virtualizing servers.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to JEFFREY NICKERSON whose telephone number is
(571)270-3631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 8:30-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number
for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a
USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information
system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. N./
Jeffrey Nickerson
Examiner, Art Unit 2142

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2142